(1)

91-1751

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAY 4 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

NO. _____

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1991

O. R. KARST

Petitioner,

Vs.

JOHN WOODS,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF APPEALS OF CALIFORNIA FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT DIVISION FIVE

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

OF COUNSEL :

O. R. KARST

910 Pierce Street

Albany, CA. 94706

Tele-I-510-526-8500

PRO-SE :

THE QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW :

Question No. I.

In that, The acting attorney, was able to falsify the official judicial litigation, Which become in themselves Bogus, Counterfeit, Void by the content of the Law.

Question No. 2.

In that, The acting State Courts, The acting State Judges of first apperance knew, or should have known, With a Finding of Facts, that the acting attorney,s Judicial Litigation was Falsified, Bogus, Void by the Content of the Law.

Question No. 3.

In that, The acting State Court, The acting State Judges of the first apperance are acting above the Law, To lend there signatures, to the Falsified Judicial Proceedure was a Abuse of there Judicial Discretion.

Question No. 4.

In that, The acting State Appeals Court of First

apperance, Are acting above the Law, to lend there signatures to the Falsified Judicial Proceedure, Which in them selves are Bogus, Counterfeit, Void by the contents of the Law, And is a Abuse of there Judicial Discretion.

Question No. 5.

In that, The acting State Supreme Court of First apperance, Are acting above the Law, To lend there signatures to the Falsified Judicial Proceedure, Which in its self a Abuse of there Judicial

Question No. 6.

In that, The acting U. S. Supreme Court, The Court of Finial apperance, is being called upon to lend them selves to act upon Judicial Proceedure that is Bogus, Counterfeit, Void as to content of the Law.

Question No. 7.

In that, The acting U. S. Supreme Court has Jurisdiction, Has the Judicial Rights, To seek Manatory State Rights, Due Process of Law. Equal Rights, In who,s State has Clearly Deprived him

of His State,s Constitutional Law, Federal Constitutional laws.

Question No. 8.

In that, The acting U. S. Supreme Court has Jurisdiction to Exercise there Court,s Power of Supervision, That this Nemed State Court have Rendered Decision so far Departed from accepted, and Usual Course of Judicial Proceedure, or Sanction such a Departure.

Question No. 9.

In that, The acting U. S, Supreme Court has Jurisdiction to Exercise there Court,s Power in this named State,s Court Decision conflict with Federal Question of Law.

Question No. IO.

In that, The acting U. S. Supreme Court, As to now Exercise this Court,s Power to under-write this Writ of Certiorari To :

(a) Secure the Uniformity of Decision.

(b) Secure State Judicial Proceedure.

(c) Settlement of Question of Law.

(d) Secure Federal Judicial Proceedure.

(e) Secure U. S. Supreme Court,s Judicial Proceedure.

Rule I5. I. (b) Footnote

"Reference is hereby made, that earlier documents contains the caption of the case in this court and the names of all such parties sought to be reviewed by this court, in addition to the proceedings are party to but not a party of (a) Mrs Kathleen M. Karst, 9I0 Pierce Street, Albany, CA. 94706, tele I-5I0-525-9472"

TABLE OF CONTENT

I.	The Question Presented	I-4
2.	Rule I5, I. (b) Foot-note	4
3.	Table of Authorities	5
4.	A Referance of the Official Opinion Delivered by other Courts.	6-7
5.	A Concise Statement of the Grounds on which the Jurisdiction is Invoked.	8-I0
6.	Date of Entry of the Judgment Sough to be Reviewed.	II
7.	The Statutory Provision beleived to confer on this Court Jurisdiction to review the Judgment or Decree in Question By Writ.	I2
8.	VERBATION: Const. Provision, Statutes, Appropriate Citations.	I3-I5
9.	A Concise statement of the case containing the Material Facts to the Consideration of the Question	I6-2I
I0	A Review of the Judgment of the State Courts at which the Federal Question where Raised.	22-25
II	Argument Amplifying the reasons Relied on for the allowance of Writ.	26-28
I2	APPENDIX	I-9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

I. California Constitution.

2. California,s Rules of Court.

3. California,s Supreme Court, Appellate Rules.

4. Calif. Internal Operating Practice and Procedures of the courts of Appeals.

5. California,s Statutory Laws.

6. Calif. Civil Practice
C.C.P. section 473 (3), (4).

7. U.S. Constitution.

8. U.S. Const. Amend. 5th, 7th, I4th.

9. Title 28 U.S.C. section I443.

IO. Title 42 U.S.C. sec. I982, I983, I988.

II. F.R.C.P. Rules, 38, 55 (c) (2), 60 (b) (4).

A REFERANCE OF THE OFFICIAL OPINION DELIVERED BY OTHER COURTS :

No. I.

That other Calif. Courts, That other Federal Courts, call for the Prefection of Due Process of Law, As a Matter of right, as a Matter of Law and the Decision there from, Delivered in this Case, Where the Defendant had not been Noticed to appear by the Plaintiff to appear at his Default, His Default Hearing, His Default. His Default Judgment, That there was no Notice to Appear, That under Calif Statute, Federal Statutory Laws have set aside Defaults, Defaults, Default Judgment taken without the Required Notice to the Defendant, That in Fact, An Un-Noticed Default Judgment are Void by the content of the Law,

State of Calif. C.C.P. section 473, which holds relief from judgment taken by surprise, vacating void judgment,set asidean void judgment,
Baird v Smith 216 cal 408 14 p2d 749 1932
Crofton v Young 48 ca ap2d 452 119 1003 1942
Miller v Cortese 110 ca ap2d 101 242 p2d 1952
Winkoven v winkoven 201 f2d 174 (ca 9 th)

the U.S. Const. 5th Amend, due process of law, 7th amend,civil trial, I4th amend,
U.S.C. title 42, section I982, section I983
F.R.C.P. rule38 trial,55 (c) (2) setting aside default, rule 60 (b) (4) relief from default judgment,
Edson v Edson I08 mass 590
Harjo v Johnson I87 okla
Reeder v Marshall 2I4 ore
Taft v Taft 252 miss
Walker v Hall I76 ga
Anderson v Taylorcraft I97 dc pa
Loranger v alban 22 nj
Ashley v Hyde 6 ark
Coltas v Smith 96 ariz
Calton v Hurst I63 md
Peterson v Millian 70 sd
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT :
Bass v Hoagland 388 us
Hovey v Elliot I67 us
Mc Donald v Mable 243 us
Winsor v Mcveigh 93 us

A CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE GROUNDS ON WHICH THE JURISDICTION OF THIS COURT IS INVOKED :

No. I.

In that, The acting attorney, the attorney of record in Calif. Court,s systerm, Acting above the Law, has Falsified the Judicial Proceedure, That caused the Proceedure to be Bogus, Counterfeit, Void by the content of the Law.

No. 2.

In that, The acting clerk, Judges, Courts have not made a finding of Facts, Givin ample Judicial Proceedures that would make known this Bogus Judicial Proceedure.

No. 3.

In that, Acting clerks, Judges, Courts, Acting above the Law, have signed, have Honored the Falsified Judicial Papers.

No. 4.

In that, Acting Judges, Court of First Apperance, Court of Appellate apperance, acting above the Law, Continue to Sanction the Falsified,

Bogus, Counterfiet , Void by the Law, In which they have so far departed from accepted and usual course of Judicial Proceedure.

No. 5.

In that, The Bogus Falsified, Counterfeit, Void Judicial Papers, now appear before the U. S. Supreme Court Intack, Awaiting Decision.

No. 6.

In that, The Honorable U. S. Supreme Court, To Call for an Exercise of there Court,s Power of Supervision, The Judicial Finding of Facts,As to this Falsification, Bogus, Counterfeit Judicial Proceedures.

No. 7.

In that, futher Grounds for Jurisdiction in the U. S. Supreme Court are the Statutory Bases for Federal Jurisdiction to Uphold the Rights of a Citizen, Whom has been Denied, or can not Enforce in the Court of such State a Right under any Law providing His Due Process of Law, Equal Rights, As to have Adbridged His Rights, Statutes

Judicial Proceedures, And Can Not Enforce for Effective Relief from the Falsified, Counterfeit, Void Defaulted Judgment, and the Injury Sustained there from.

No. 8.

The Jurisdiction of the U. S. Supreme Court is Invoked, To Maintain the Uniformity of Decision, Of Compainion Cases, Rights of a Trial, U. S. Constitutional Law, Federal Statutory Laws.

DATE OF ENTRY OF THE JUDGMENT SOUGH TO BE REVIEWED.

No. I. Feb II, I992.	LUCAS Chief Justice
No. 2. Dec I2, I99I.	HANING, Acting P.J.
No. 3. Nov I2, I99I.	KING, Acting P.J.
No. 4. Jul I9, I99I.	VON DER MEHDEN, Judge
No. 5. Dec 29, I983.	BETTINELLI, Judge
No. 6. Jan I3, I984.	BOONE, Judge

THE STATUTORY PROVISION BELEIVED TO CONFER ON THIS COURT JURISDICTION TO REVIEW THE JUDGMENT OR DECREE IN QUESTION BY WRIT OF CERTIORARI

I. The U.S. Constitution.

2. The U.S..Const. Amend. 5th, 7th, I4th.

3. Title 28 U.S.C. sections I443.

4. Title 42 U.S.C. sec. I982, I983, I988.

5. F.R.C.P. Rules, 38, 55 (c) (2), 60 (b) (4).

6. State of Calif. C.C.P. section 473 (3),(4).

VERBATIN, CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION, STATUTES,

APPROPRIATE CITATIONS.

I. The U.S. Constitution Articule III, "Judiciary.

2. 5th Amendment,"Due process of Law", In Part, Nor be deprived of life, liberty, Or property, with out due Process of Law.

3. 7th Amend., "Civil Trial", In Part, In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-xamined in any court of the U.S. THAN ACCORDING TO RULES OF COMM LAW

4. I4th Amend. In Part, which holds, Due process of law, nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, with out due process, Equal protection, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the Equalprotection of law.

5. Title 28 U.S.C. sections I443. In Part, which holds, any of the following civil action, commenced in a state court, may be removed to U.S. Courts.

6. Title 42 U.S.C. section I982, In Part, which holds, all citizens of the U.S. shall have the same rights in every state, thereof to inherit, purchase, lease,sell, hold and convey real and personal propert

7. Title 42 U.S.C. section I983, In Part, which holds for redress in part every person who under color of any statute, or us-

age of any state subject any citizen, there of to the deprivation of any right secured by the constitution and the laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law suit in Equity or other proper proceeding for redress.

8. Title 42 U.S.C. section I988, In Part, which holds for proceeding in vindiction of civil rights, attorney,s fees, the jurisdiction in civil matters conferred on district courts by the provision of this title, for the protection of all persons, in their civil rights and for their vindiction shall be enforced in conformity with the laws, to enforce section, I98I, I982, I983, I985, I986, the court in its discretion may allow the prevailing party reasonable attorney,s fee as part of the costs.

9. Federal Rules of Civil Practice :

Rule 38, Jury trial of right.

Rule 55 (c) (2) Default, Setting Aside Default.

Rule 60 (b) (4) Relief from Judgment-Mistake.

IO. State of California,s C.C.P. sec. (3) (4), section 473, In Part which holds relief from a Judgment taken by surprise, Vacating the Void Judgment or Order, To set aside an Void Judgment or Order.

A CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE CONTAINING THE MATERIAL FACTS TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE QUESTION PRESENTED :

No. I.

In that, Mr O. R. Karst, the appellant, in this Petition for Writ of Certiorari, was the Defendant in the Calif. Superior Court, of Sonoma County, Case number I3II22, Woods Vs. Karst, now known as the Court of First Apperance, That plaintiff Mr Woods,s acting attorney, Acting above the Law, Falsified the Judicial records, Falsified the Judgment, That the Judicial Proceedure is Now Bogus, Now Counterfeit, Now Void as to the Law.

No. 2.

In that, The Acting Court, The Acting Judge of the first apperance, Acting above the Law, Knew or Should Have Known, With Ample Good Cause Showing, With a Finding of Facts, That Plaintiff,s Judicial Proceedure Was Now Bogus, Now Void as to Calif. and Federal Laws.

No. 3.

In that, The Acting Courts, The Acting Judges of the first apperance, Acting Above the Law, Now lends there Approved Signatures to Plaintiff,s Woods Falsified Judicial Proceedures, That They Knew or Should Have Known, That with the Approval of there Signature is a Abuse of there Judicial Discretion.

No. 4.

In that, The Calif. Appeals Court, Acting above the Law, Knew or Should have Known, With Ample Good Cause Showing, That with Judicial finding of Facts, That Plaintiff,s Judicial Proceedure, Litigation, Moving Papers where Falsified, Bogus, Counterfeit, and as Void to Calif. and Federal Judicial Laws, And that they Knew or Should have Known, Was a Abuse of there Discretion to Rule in Favor of Plaintiff,s Bogus Judicial Proceedure, and againts the Defendant.

No. 5.

In that, The Calif. Supreme Court, there Acting

Supreme Court Judges, of there finial apperance Acting above the Law, Knew or Should have Known, With Ample Good Cause Showing, That with Judicial Finding of Facts, That Plaintiff,s Judicial Proceedure, Litigation, Moving Papers where Falsefied Bogus, Counterfeit, and Void as to Calif. and Federal Judicial Laws, And that they Knew or Should have Known. Was a Abuse of there Discretion, To Rule in Favor of Plaintiff,s Bogus Judicial Proceedure, And Againts the Defendant.

No. 6.

Now Comes the U. S. Supreme Court, The Court of Finial Apperance, Acting to Honor the Finial Judicial Proceedure, That the Material Facts to the Finial Consideration of the Question Presented is :

(a)

Contrary to the Volumes of Papers Presented to this Day, Mr Woods now the respondent, That his Judicial Papers, His Litigation, His Moving Papers are still Bogus, Counterfeit, Void as to Law.

(b)

Contrary to the Volumes of Litigation presented in this Case, Calif. Acting Courts, Judges, from the Court of First Apperance, To the State,s Final Court, With Ample Good Cause Showing, Have Failed to Make a simple Finding of Facts, This Finding would Hold, That the On-Going Respondent,s Judicial Proceedure is Bogus, Void as to State and Federal Laws.

(c)

Contrary to the Volumes of Litigation presented in this Case, That Calif. Acting Courts and Jurges are protecting and preserving Falsified Judicial Papers as the Foundation of there Decision, All in Favor of Plaintiff and Againts the Defendant.

(d)

That the Jurisdiction to Come before the U. S. Supreme Court Exist, To Seek Manatory State,s Rights,manatory Due Process of Laws, Equal

Rights, Who,s State Clearly Deprived Him of all of His State,s Rights, Due Process of Law, State Constitutional Laws, Federal Constitutional Law.

No. 7.

That the Named State Court have Rendered Decision in Conflick, in which they have So Far Departed from Accepted and Usual course of Judicial Proceedure or Sanctioned such a Departure by Lower Courts, As to Call for An Exercise of there Court,s Power of Supervision.

No. 8.

That the Named State Court has Decided an or Denied a Federal Ouestion in such a Way, That Conflict with Applicable Decision of this Honorable U. S. Supreme Court.

No. 9.

That this Honorable U. S. Supreme Court, As to Exercise this Court,s Power of Supervision to Under-Write the Jurisdiction of this Writ.

No. IO.

The Jurisdiction of the U. S. Supreme Court to :

(a)

Secure the Uniformity of Decision.

(b)

Settlement of Question of Laws.

(c)

Secure Calif. Judicial Proceedure.

(d)

Secure Federal Judicial Proceedure.

(e)

Secure the U. S. Supreme Court,s Judicial.

A REVIEW : OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE STATE COURTS AT WHICH THE FEDERAL QUESTION WERE RAISED.

No. I. Date of entry of Judgment, Feb II 1992.

In that, O. R. KARST, the appellant filed his memorandum of points and authorities in ...e court of first apperance, that plaintiff and plaintiff,s attorney illegalty litigation, using Bogus litigation, can not be a additional Bogus, have Falisfys the records, Falsehood of Judgment, Falsework of enforcement, uninforceable by any Court, Falsified the records, That this Falsification continues to this day, in Falsely certified documents, Misapperhended the Facts, Falsely activated Litigation, That the Court of First Apperance Denied the Administration of the Law, But Abused their Descretion in Honoring Falsified Documentation. In That, the Court of Appeal, The Calif. Supreme Court have Abused their Discretion in the Denial of Appellant,s Review.

No. 2. Date of entry of Judgment, Dec 29th, Dec 30th,83, I-I3-84.

In that O. R. KARST, the Appellant Filed his Memorandum of points and authorities, his Declaration in the Court of First Apperance, Court of Appeal, Calif. Supreme Court, that he was Entitled to a Trial, The Court,s however have Abused their Discretion in there Actions to Order His Default, Ordered His answers stricken, Ordered His Default Judgment Entered, Ordered His Default Judgment, All of this Court,s Default Action was taken at a Default Hearing in which he was Not Noticed to appear, There Being No-Proof of Service to him, That He Motioned the Court,s to Set-Aside this Default, Default Judgment, on the Grounds that he had not been Noticed to Appear, under C.C.P. section 473 (3), (4). State and Federal Constitution, the 5th, 7th, I4th, admendments, F.R.-C.P. rules 55 (c) (2), 60 (b) (4).

That all the Calif. Courts have Denied his action to Set-Aside the Un-Noticed Default Hearing,

That the Calif Court,s know, or Should-Have Known, That a Default, Default Judgment taken at a Hearing in which the Defendant was Not-Noticed to Appear, That under the Calif. Constitution, Calif. Statorty Laws, Due Process of these Laws, That the Calif. Court,s have given Birth to a Misscarriage of Justice, That this Default, Default Judgment is Bogus, Void, and with No-Consouence to the Laws, That this Honorable U.S. Supreme Court is Needed to Exercise This Court,s Power there Jurisdiction to Review this Default, Default Judgment on a "WRIT OF CERTORARI" To Secure the Many Particular Federal Questions, To Up-Hold the Constitution, To Maintain Uniformity, With Special and Inportant Reasons of Conflict, So Far Departed from Accepted and Usual Course of Proceedings or have Sanctioned such a Departure, and that Calif. State Proceedings Conflects with other State Courts, and the Court of the U.S. Supreme Court to the Prefection of this

Default, Default Judgment Be Set-Aside, Be Dismissed With Prejudice.

ARGUMENT AMPLIFYING THE REASONS RELIED ON FOR THE ALLOWANCE OF THE WRIT

No. I. In that, It can no longer go Un-Noticed, That O. R. KARST,s Litigation has lost its Credibility, Examplified Thoughout the hundreds of pages of the records, and other such Materials, It clearly shows the Betrayed Systerm of Justice, Complete Adbandoment of the Law, as a Matter of Law, as a Matter of Right, Seeming Incapble to Administrate the Case, Failing to Up-Hold the Law, Failed to Up-Hold the Constitution, That somehow they have based their decision on the Un-Trueth of the Case, To have Plagued them-selfs with the Deficiencies of Accountability, Failing to up hold the Jurisdiction of the Judicial Systerm, It is Crystal Clear, That the State of Calif. has Deprived him of all of his State,s Rights, Adbriged His Constitution Rights, Due Process of the Law, Equal Rights, Federal Constitutional Rights, Abused their Discretion, Infrac-

tion of the Law, Unlawfull Proceeding, Contray to Law, To Deceive the Systerm of Justice.

No. 2. In That, There is no Question, that His case should not end in the manner that the Court have Mandated up to this time, A Crusade of Court Malpractice, Each Judge, Each Court somehow adding to this Malpractice in its own Distinctive Way, Each Court adding to the Complicity of their Prejudice againts Him.

No. 3. In That, There is no Question,That the U.S. Supreme Court has Subject Matter Jurisdiction as such to Restore the Credibility of the Judicial Systerm in this Case, For the Allowance of the Writ on the Fundamental Right, The Issue of Law, To Secure the Many Particular Question, Maintain Uniformity, Furtherance of Justice, That there is No Plain, Speedy or Adequate Remendy in the Ordinary Course of the Law, Than by this Court,s Prefection for the Allowance of the Writ.

I have a clear and precise right for an Issuance of this dscision, I declare, that the fore going appeal, the contents there of is true and correct of my own knowledge, except as to matters which are therein stated upon my information and belief, and as to those matters I believe it to be true, I declare, under penalty of perjury, under the laws, that the fore going is true and correct, executed with signture to this appeal.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED.

BY. O. R. Karst

O. R. KARST

910 Pierce Street

Albany,CA. 94706

Tele-I-510-526-8500

OF COUNSEL: PRO-SE.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX : TABLE OF CONTENTS :

Appellant,s petition for review DENIED.	No. I
Motion to reinstate appeal is DENIED.	No. 2
Motion to dismiss appeal is Granted.	No. 3
Motion to Set-Aside Falsifyied.	No. 4.
Court Grants Default.	No. 5.
Court entered Default Judgment.	No. 6.

APPENDIX NO. I.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
In Bank SO24378
First Appellate CT. AO54777
Superior Court I3II22

JOHN WOODS, Respondent

V.

O. R. KARST, Appellant.

Petition for Hearing, By the Calif. Supreme Court, and or in the Alternative, Order to Rein-State Appellant,s Dismissed Appeal, Order from the Chief Justice to Grant Permission to Hear Appellant,s Appeal in Supreme Court.

BY THE COURT :

Appellant,s petition for revied DENIED.

Dated Feb II 1992. /s/ LUCAS
Chief Justice

DISCUSSION

In regards to this Order, It being a Fact, That the Calif. Supreme Court abused their discretion in Appellant,s Petition for review being Denied That the Issue presented to their Court for review was the fact, that the First Appellate Court used a Bogus Method to dismiss my appeal, Illegally Interfered with the jurisdiction of my appeal, By-Passing Appellate Court rules, did not allow normal appellate proceedure, normal appellate Court rules, Aborted the Jurisdiction of my appeal, When the First Appellate Court Illegally Dismissed My Appeal.

APPENDIX NO. 2.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

JOHN WOODS, Respondent,

V.

O. R. KARST, Appellant.

Appeal Court No. A054777
Sonoma Sup Court No. I3II22

Motion for Order : To Reinstate Appellant,s Appeal, Memorandum of Points And Authorities.

BY THE COURT :

The Motion to Reinstate Appeal is DENIED.

Dated Dec I2 I99I

/s/ HANING
Acting P. J.

DISCUSSION

In regards to this Order, This Appellate Court failed to reinstate my appeal, Even though the Appellate Court had previous dismissed my appeal, In the Light, That my appeal had all of its outstanding briefs still due that delt with the facts of the case, the statement of the case, the nature of the action, That this Appellate Court altered the course of Appellate Court Rules, in an adbandonment of the merit of a appeal, the determinnation of a appeal, That the order of dismissal is premature, the fundamental point of dismissal has been erroneously interpretated without foundation, an of No-Merit of the facts in my Appeal.

APPENDIX NO. 3.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

JOHN WOOD[illegible], Respondent,

V.

O. R. KARST, Appellant.

Appeal Court No. A054777
Sonoma Sup Court No. I3II22

Civil Docketing Statement, Court of Appeal, for the ~~First District~~.

BY THE COURT :

The Motion to Dismiss Appeal is Granted and the Appeal on file herein is order Dismissed.

Dated Nov I2 I99I

/s/ KING
Acting P. J.

DISCUSSION

In regards to this order, This Appellate Court dismissed my appeal from a motion to dismiss, In Light of, That there was no motion to dismiss, served, filed or otherwise of record, That my dismissal was premature under Calif. Appellate rules of Court, That my briefs where still outstanding, still not due and had not been filed as such, The facts of the case where still out standing,As where the statement of the case,and the nature of the action, All of which would lead to the determinnation of my appeal, That there is no Appellate Jurisdiction, No Just-

tification, No-Duty to alter the course of the Appellate Systerm, The Appellate rules of Court, a Comitted abuse of the Appellate Systerm, Directed Soly to the Apprant Disregard of their own rules, The Alter Of Their Oath.

APPENDIX NO. 4.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIF.

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA

JOHN WOODS, Respondent

Sonoma Sup. Court
No. I3II22

V.

O. R. KARST, Appellant.

Motion To-Set-Aside Falsifyied Judgment, Falsifyied abstract of Judgment, Writ of Execution, Falsifyied Appellate,s Court Remittitur.

BY THE COURT :

HEREBY DENIED :

Dated July I9 I99I

/s/ L. VON DER MEHDEN
Judge

DISCUSSION

In regards to this order, That this Superior Court denied the finding of Falsifyied Documentation in their Court, In light of the fact, That the Attorney,s fee Remittitur is falsifyied, That this superior Court Judge order me to pay the falsifyied Attorney,s Fee.

APPENDIX NO. 5.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA

JOHN WOODS, Respondent, SONOMA SUP. COURT NO. I3II22

V.

O. R. KARST, Appellant.

EX-PARTE ORDER SHORTENING TIME: MOTION TO STRIKE ANSWERS: REQUEST TO ENTER DEFAULT JUDGMENT: FIX ATTORNEY,S FEES:

BY THE COURT :

Defendant is not Present :
Court Grants the Motion to strike, Without leave to ammend : And Enters the Default againts the Defendant O. R. KARST :

Dated Dec 29 I983 /s/ W. BETTINELLI
JUDGE

DISCUSSION

In regards to this Order, That Judge Bettinelli, the Judge of first apperance, Law and Motion calendar action No. I3II22, Abused Calif. Statutory rules of court, in light of the fact, It being the law, that Judge Bettinelli had signed an Ex-Parte Order, That I be served his order of a Default Hearing shall be set and heared on Dec 29 I983 in his court, It is well settled that I was not served with his order, That I had no knowledge of my Default Hearing, and I was not present because I had not been served his Ex-Parte Order, and I was unable to Defend the Default Hearing, That Judge Bettinelli proceeded

with my Default, Default Hearing, Default Judgment, even though, that I had not been served the Notice to Appear, there being NO-Proof-service, even though Calif. Rules of Court provide that I shall be Noticed to Appear at my Default Hearing, That Judge Bettinelli abused the Court,s Discretion in the Denial of my right to be present at my Default Proceedings, Denial of my right to defend My Self, Right to appear, My Due Process of Law. State constitutional, Federal rights, That his action has given birth to a Void Default, Default Jud gment, Void as to the Law, A Nullity to Its Self, That now becomes An Revocable Error comitted by this Judge.

APPENDIX NO. 6.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SONOMA

JOHN WOODS, Respondent, SONOMA SUP. COURT NO. I3II22

V.

O. R. KARST, Appellant.

DEFAULT JUDGMENT :

BY THE COURT :

JUDGMENT ENTERED :

Dated Jan I3 I984 /s/ W. BOONE
JUDGE

DISCUSSION

In regards to this Order ; That Judge Boone, law and motion calendar action No. I3II22, Abused Calif. Statutory Rules of the Court, In Light of the Fact, That I had Notified the Court in writing, That I had not been Noticed to Appear at my Default Hearing, and I was not there for that reason, That I was Unable to Defend My Self, That I was Denied Due Process of Law, And that under Calif Statutory Law, That my Default, Default Judgment Shall be Set-Aside, That Judge Boone Abused the Calif. Statutory Laws in his Order to Enter the Default Judgment, That he errored in not Setting Aside the Un-Noticed Default Judgment as Required under Calif. Rules of Court, That his action are Contrary to Judicial Justice, Void as to the Law, That Now Becomes an Re-Vocable Error Comitted by this Judge.